

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/690,289 10/21/2003		Sheila Shaw	SS-101.P.1	4575		
24232	7590 09/14/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	PRESTON & ASSOCIA	THOMPSON,	THOMPSON, KATHRYN L			
12625 HIGH SUITE 205	BLUFF DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130			3763			
			DATE MAILED: 09/14/200-	4		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/690,2	89	SHAW, SHEILA	$\mathcal{C}\mathcal{N}$		
		Examine	r	Art Unit			
	•	. Kathryn L	Thompson	3763			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	cation appears on th	e cover sheet with t	he correspondence ad	dress		
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNInsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 period for reply is specified above, the maximum stare to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no exunication. o) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and vwill, by statute, cause the app	vent, however, may a reply tutory minimum of thirty (30 vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS plication to become ABAND	be timely filed b) days will be considered timely from the mailing date of this continued to the continued of the continued			
Status							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>10/21/0</u> 3.					
2a)□							
3)□	,						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5) <u>□</u> 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. i) Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or b ction to the drawing(s) the correction is requi	be held in abeyance. red if the drawing(s) i	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CF			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12)[a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority 2. Certified copies of the priority 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation See the attached detailed Office action	documents have been documents have been of the priority documenal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Appl ents have been rec le 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National	Stage		
2) Notice (3) Infor	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Pmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or er No(s)/Mail Date 2/22/24			mary (PTO-413) ail Date mal Patent Application (PTC)-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1-11 are objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant positively recites a security band that is not detachable. Examiner respectfully disagrees and believes that Applicant's security band can be detachable. For example, if one were to take a pair of scissors and cut the band, it would become detachable. Unless Applicant states how the band is not susceptible to becoming detached, Examiner cannot see how Applicant's band is not able to be detached with a pair of scissors or any other cutting means. One possibility could be that the user of the band him/herself decides whether he/she wants the band to be detachable. If this were to be the case, then for purposes of the prior art rejection, Examiner interprets not detachable to mean whether the user wants to detach the band or not. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blair (US 5,304,145), Chandler (US 5,468,229) (Column 2, Line 25), Bennes et al (US

Application/Control Number: 10/690,289

Art Unit: 3763

5,853,396), Sutherland et al (US 6,126,639) (Column 3, Line 58), Lee (6,436,074) (Column 3, Line 26), and McDaniel (US 6,544,232). The prior art discloses a peritoneal dialysis security band comprising an elastic band, a catheter retaining pocket positioned along a portion of said elastic band, wherein said pocket is able to accept a catheter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair, Chandler, Bennes et al, Sutherland et al, Lee, and McDaniel. The prior art does not disclose expressly that the elastic band has a width from about 3 inches to about 6 inches. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the band from about 3 to 6 inches in width because Applicant has not disclosed that these dimensions provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the dimensions taught by the prior art or the claimed 3 to 6 inches because both dimensions perform the same function equally well. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the prior art to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 7.

Application/Control Number: 10/690,289

Art Unit: 3763

Conclusion

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn L. Thompson whose telephone number is 703-305-3286. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM: 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KLT

KKI -

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700